



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/446,583	12/22/1999	PHILIP C. LEVERIDGE	36-1302	2585
23117	7590	01/28/2004	EXAMINER	
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 1100 N GLEBE ROAD 8TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22201-4714			BAUGH, APRIL L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2141	14
DATE MAILED: 01/28/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/446,583

Applicant(s)

LEVERIDGE ET AL.

Examiner

April L Baugh

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 16-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant has amended claims 1-8, 9-10, 14, and 16 and canceled claim 15, and added new claims 20-22. Therefore claims 1-14 and 16-22 are now pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed November 3, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the invention validates and stores a unique identifier for the client application of the user versus the client terminal of the user. Applicant has amended claims to teach "a method of operating an authenticating server system for authenticating a user of a client application provided on a client terminal...storing in the resource server authentication details including unique identifier for the client application of the user..." However it is the examiner's opinion that the subject matter presented in the amended claims is not present in the description of the invention and thus is rejected under 35 USC 112.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 2141

3. Claims 1-14 and 16-22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant has amended claims to teach “a method of operating an authenticating server system for authenticating a user of a client application provided on a client terminal...storing in the resource server authentication details including unique identifier for the client application of the user...” The subject matter presented in the amended claims is not present in the description of the invention (page 2, lines 5-8, 12, and 15, page 7, lines 25-26, page 10, lines 25-30, page 12, lines 8-12, and page 13, lines 15-23). The specification states, “...method of operating an authenticating server system for authenticating users at client terminals connected via a data communications...issuing an identifier for the user’s terminal...said identifier to be a validated identifier of a terminal...an application server sends the application client a cookie containing in the ‘NAME=VALUE’ field an identifying tag for the user, referred to herein as an address token since it replaces the IP address as the means for identifying the user... the address token uniquely identifies the user terminal.”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 8-11, 13, 15-19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US. Patent No. 5,708,780 to Levergood et al. in view of Kirsch.

Regarding claim 1, Levergood et al. teaches a method of operating an authenticating server system for authenticating users at client terminals connected via a data communications network (column 3, lines 8-9), to control access to documents stored on a resource server, said method comprising performing the following steps in said server system: storing authentication details of authorized users (column 6, lines 61-63); receiving at the resource server authentication data for a user from a client terminal of the user, and validating at the resource server said authentication data by reference to said stored authentication details (column 3, lines 25-26 and column 6, lines 58-60); and enabling said resource server to validate a request for said document from the client terminal of said user, which request includes said identifier, by checking that said stored access status includes said document (column 6, lines 58-65 and column 7, lines 51-53 and 63-67 and Fig.2B).

Levergood et al. does not teach storing in the resource server authentication details and access status data of authorized users. Kirsch teaches storing in the resource server authentication details and access status data of authorized users; storing at the resource server (1) an identifier for the client terminal, the identifier indicating said terminal to be currently authenticated terminal; and (2) the access status of the user of the currently authenticated terminal (column 2, lines 34-37 and 42-46 and column 4, lines 51-54 and 58-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the internet server access control and monitoring system of Levergood et al. by storing in the resource server authentication details and access status data of authorized users because this

Art Unit: 2141

provides added security in a efficient manner where the server can verify authentication by comparing client submitted identification with the stored access status data of the server.

Regarding claim 2, Levergood et al. teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said identifier is transmitted to said client terminal (column 3, lines 30-32).

Levergood et al. does not teach the transmission of the identifier in a cookie. Kirsch teaches that said identifier is transmitted in a cookie to said user's client terminal (column 3, lines 14-16 and column 13, lines 11-13). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the internet server access control and monitoring system of Levergood et al. by transmitting the identifier in a cookie because it is a more secure manner of storage and transport of identification data.

Regarding claim 9, Levergood et al. teaches a method of operating an authenticating server system for authenticating users at client terminals connected via a data communications network (column 3, lines 8-9), to control access to a document stored on a resource server, said method comprising performing the following steps in said server system: storing authentication details of authorized users (column 6, lines 61-63); performing at the at least one of the resource servers remote authentication of a user by reference to said stored authentication details (column 3, lines 25-26 and column 6, lines 58-65 and column 7, lines 51-53 and 63-67 and Fig.2B) and during said remote authentication step generating the access status data of the user, distinguishing said user from other users which are not currently authenticated (column 6, lines 61-63), and a secret encryption key shared with said user (column 5, lines 61-65); resource servers to check an authentication status of said user by using an identifier for the user's client terminal received in a service request (column 3, lines 13-16 and column 6, lines 58-65 and

Art Unit: 2141

column 7, lines 51-53 and 63-67 and Fig.2B); and storing said shared secret key in a data store accessible by at least one of said resource servers for use during communications with said user (column 5, lines 61-65).

Levergood et al. does not teach storing in at least one of the resource servers authentication details and access status data of authorized users. Kirsch teaches storing in at least one of the resource servers authentication details and access status data of authorized users; storing said access status data in the at least one of the resource servers to check authentication status of said user by using an identifier for the client terminal received in a service request to check the stored access status data (column 2, lines 34-37 and 42-46 and column 4, lines 51-54 and 58-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the Internet server access control and monitoring system of Levergood et al. by storing in at least one of the resource servers authentication details and access status data of authorized users because this provides added security in a efficient manner where the server can verify authentication by comparing client submitted identification with the stored access status data of the server.

Referring to claim 3, Levergood et al. teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said authentication step comprises receiving said identifier from said client terminal with said authentication data (column 3, lines 44-47).

Regarding claim 4, Levergood et al teaches a method according to claim 3, wherein a new identifier is issued to said client terminal if said authentication data is invalid (column 5, lines 46-49).

Referring to claim 8, Levergood et al. teaches a method according to claim 1, comprising authenticating said user for access to a plurality of Web servers located in the same Internet domain (column 3, lines 66-67); and enabling each of said Web servers to validate document requests from the client terminal, which requests include said identifier (column 3, lines 44-45), by checking said status data on receipt of a document request (column 6, lines 58-60).

Referring to claim 10, Levergood et al. teaches a method according to claim 9, wherein said remote authenticating step comprises issuing a challenge to the client terminal, receiving a response to said challenge, and verifying said response (column 6, lines 45-49 and 58-60).

Referring to claim 11, Levergood et al. teaches a method according to claim 9, further comprising updating said access status data for an authenticated user following said storing step (column 7, lines 31-34 and 63-64).

Regarding claim 13, Levergood et al. teaches a method according to claim 11, wherein said updating step is performed in response to access by one of said resource servers to said access status data (column 8, lines 52-55).

Regarding claim 15, Levergood et al. teaches a method according to claim 9, wherein said identifier is an IP address of the client terminal (column 1, lines 39-41).

Referring to claim 16, Levergood et al. teaches a method according to claim 9, wherein said authentication step comprises issuing said identifier to the client terminal (column 3, lines 30-32).

Regarding claim 17, Levergood et al. teaches a method according to claim 9, wherein said access status data is stored in a data store of at least one of said resource servers (column 6, lines 61-63 and column 7, lines 31-34).

Referring to claim 18, Levergood et al. teaches a method according to claim 9, wherein said authentication details include data identifying the rights of access of individual users to one or more of said resource servers (column 3, lines 50-52).

Regarding claim 19, Levergood et al. teaches an authenticating server system adapted to perform the method of claim 1 (column 5, lines 48-49 and column 6, lines 58-60).

3. Claim 5-7, 12, and 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,708,780 to Levergood et al. in view of Kirsch as applied to claim 1-4, 8-11, 13, 15-19 above, and further in view of See et al.

Regarding claim 5, Levergood et al. teaches of an identifier (column 1, lines 39-41), and the reception of an invalid authenticator from said client terminal (column 7, lines 13-14).

Levergood et al. does not teach that the identifier contains the number of times an invalid authenticator was received. See et al. teaches said identifier comprises data indicating the number of times an invalid authenticator has been received from said user's client terminal (column 3, lines 23-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the internet server access control and monitoring system of Levergood et al. by having the identifier contain the number of times an invalid authenticator was received because a user can be denied access if they submit multiple invalid authenticators thus providing the system with added security and access control.

Referring to claim 6, Levergood et al. teaches of an identifier (column 1, lines 39-41), and the reception of an invalid authenticator from said client terminal (column 7, lines 13-14).

Levergood et al. does not teach that the system will not issue identifiers to the user if an identifier received from that user shows that a predetermined number of invalid authenticators

Art Unit: 2141

have been received from the user. See et al. teaches said method comprising issuing no further identifier to said client terminal if an identifier received from said user's client terminal indicates that a predetermined number of invalid authenticators have been received from said user's client terminal (column 6, lines 23-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the internet server access control and monitoring system of Levergood et al. by not issuing identifiers to the user if an identifier received from that user shows that a predetermined number of invalid authenticators have been received from the user because this provides the system with added security and access control by not allowing unauthorized users access to server information.

Regarding claim 7, Levergood et al. teaches of an identifier (column 1, lines 39-41).

Levergood et al. does not teach of timing out of an identifier. See et al. teaches of timing out of said identifier of a terminal of a currently authenticated user if no document request is received from said client terminal for a predetermined period (column 7, lines 32-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the internet server access control and monitoring system of Levergood et al. by timing out an identifier because if a user were to forget to logout of a session another could use that workstation to access information that they are not authorized to view and the timing out of the identifier lessens the chance of this happening therefore increasing the security of the system.

Referring to claim 12, Levergood et al. teaches of an updating step (column 7, lines 31-34 and 63-64).

Levergood et al. does not teach of the updating step being performed because of a time-out. See et al. teaches said updating step is performed in response to a time-out associated with said access status data (column 7, lines 32-36 and lines 37-39). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the internet server access control and monitoring system of Levergood et al. by performing the updating step because of a time-out because this will give the system up-to-date information on the state of the workstation.

Referring to claim 14, Levergood et al. teaches a method according to claim 12, wherein said updating step is performed in response to a request by the client terminal (column 4, lines 1-4).

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2141

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to April L Baugh whose telephone number is 703-305-5317. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal D Dharia can be reached on 703-305-4003. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

ALB



RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER